Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-50 remain in the application. Claims 1, 16, 17, 29, 30, 44, and 50 have been amended.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 12-18, 26-35, 38-40, 43-46, and 49-50 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Shimozawa (JP 10303464) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found in Figs. 1, 2, and 5 and on page 4, lines 10-17 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 1, 16, 17, 29, 30, and 50 call for, *inter alia*:

a separately manufactured thermal connecting part disposed in the opening and fastened into the mount part, the thermal connecting part having at least one chip mounting area.

The configuration according to the instant application has the advantage that a thermal connecting part with a high heart capacity can be realized and that, in addition, the accumulating dissipation heat is transported to the side of the lead frame, which faces away from the chip mounting surface by means of the thermal connecting part. A compact component is thus created, which is suitable for high thermal stresses.

The Shimozawa reference discloses a heat radiating plate (10) that is placed on the leadframe. The accumulating heat is led off through the lead frame, either laterally or vertically. However, an opening is not formed in the leadframe into which the plate (10) is disposed and fastened.

The reference does not show a separately manufactured thermal connecting part disposed in the opening and fastened into the mount part, the thermal connecting part having at least one chip mounting area, as recited in claims 1, 16, 17, 29, 30, and 50 of the instant application. The Shimozawa reference discloses a heat radiating plate disposed squarely on top of

the top electrode. Shimozawa does not disclose that the heat radiating plate is disposed in and fastened to an opening in the electrode. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which a separately manufactured thermal connecting part is disposed in the opening and fastened into the mount part, the thermal connecting part having at least one chip mounting area.

The Suzuki reference discloses a semiconductor component with a lead having a semiconductor chip disposed directly on a connecting strip of the lead frame.

The Suzuki does not show a separately manufactured thermal connecting part disposed in the opening and fastened into the mount part, the thermal connecting part having at least one chip mounting area, as recited in claims 1, 16, 17, 29, 30, and 50 of the instant application.

Accordingly Suzuki does not make up for the deficiencies of Shimozawa with respect to the independent claims.

Since independent claims 1, 17, 30 are believed to be allowable, dependent claims 3, 4, 9, 12-15, 18, 26-28, 31-35, 38-40, 43-46, and 49 are believed to be allowable as well.

In the third paragraph on page 7 of the Office action, claims 2, 5-6, 10-11, 19-21, 41-42, and 47-48 have been rejected as being obvious over Shimozawa (JP 10303464) in view of Suzuki (JP 11346006) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Suzuki does not make up for the deficiencies of Suzuki. Since independent claims 1, 17, and 30 are believed to be allowable, dependent claims 2, 5-6, 10-11, 19-21, 41-42, and 47-48 are believed to be allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1, 16, 17, 29, 30, and 50. Claims 1, 16, 17, 29, 30, and 50 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claims 1, 17, or 30, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-50 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Applic. No. 10/683,712
Amdt. dated January 14, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 14, 2004

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner & Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

For Applicant(s)

AKD:cgm

January 14, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101